

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 049PCT198FO	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/001962	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 27 February 2004 (27.02.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 02 April 2003 (02.04.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant THERMOSELECT AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 60%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland Facsimile No. +41 22 740 14 35	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Date of issuance of this report 02 March 2006 (02.03.2006)</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</div></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 70</td> </tr> </table>	Date of issuance of this report 02 March 2006 (02.03.2006)	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</div>	Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 70
Date of issuance of this report 02 March 2006 (02.03.2006)				
Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</div>				
Telephone No. +41 22 338 89 70				

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Translation

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

049PCT198FO

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/001962

International filing date (day/month/year)

27.02.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

02.04.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

THERMOSELECT AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/001962

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/001962

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not yet been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/001962

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability:
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	6, 7, 10-17	YES
	Claims	1-5, 8, 9	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	1-17	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-17	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Reference is made to the following documents:

- D1: US-A-1 643 601 (DANIEL REEBE) 27 September 1927 (1927-09-27)
- D2: US-A-2 186 718 (JOHN FERGUSON) 9 January 1940 (1940-01-09)
- D3: US-A-5 567 218 (LADIRAT CHRISTIAN ET AL) 22 October 1996 (1996-10-22)
- D4: US-A-1 572 580 (CHRISTIE CHARLES H ET AL) 9 February 1926 (1926-02-09)
- D5: KLEIN K ET AL "THERMOSELECT-VERGASUNG VON ABFALLEN UNTER ATMOSPHEREENDRUCK ZUR ENERGIE- UND ROHSTOFFGEWINNUNG" VGB KRAFTWERKSTECHNIK, VGB KRAFTWERKSTECHNIK GMBH. ESSEN, DE v.75, no.6, 1 June 1995 (1995-06-05), pages 529-533, XP000512003 ISSN: 0372-5715
- D6: EP-A-0 976 806 (THERMOSELECT AG) 2 February 2000 (2000-02-02)

The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claims 1-5, 7-9 is not novel under Article 33(2).

D1 discloses a melting furnace (1) with a melt discharge (7) having a cooling device (8,10,11), whereby an instrument (19) with an internal cooling mechanism (20,21) is provided. The edge (22) of the instrument (19) can be used to remove pegs and can be actuated by a drive (37,38). Thus at least the features of claims 1-5 and 9 are anticipated by D1.

The application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claims 6,7

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/001962

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis 1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability:
citations and explanations supporting such statement

and 10-17 does not involve an inventive step under Article 33(3).

The dependent claims do not include any features which, in combination with any claim to which they refer back, meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step. Dependent claim 7 concerns a minor structural modification of the subject matter of claim 1 of the kind a person skilled in the art routinely makes on the basis of familiar considerations, especially since the resulting advantages are readily foreseeable.

Method claims 12-17 relate merely to the utilization of the instrument according to claim 1 for removing pegs. Such utilization is of the kind which a person skilled in the art routinely chooses on the basis of familiar considerations, especially since the resulting advantages are readily foreseeable.